

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claims 6 and 7 have each been made proper multiple dependent claims, each depending from claim 1 or 2; claim 9 has been made a proper singularly dependent claim depending from claim 6; and claims 11 and 12 have each been made proper singularly dependent claims, each depending from claim 1. In addition, the claims have been amended for clarity.

Applicants believe that the above changes answer the Examiner's 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) objection to claims 6-12, and respectfully request withdrawal thereof, and examination on the merits.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0240725 to Xu et al.

The Xu et al. patent publication discloses a method and apparatus for image matching, in which an input image signal having a plurality of views (e.g., a left and a right view) is processed using pixel matching to generate disparity maps for each of the views. Once these disparity maps are generated, they may be used to "generate novel images of a scene" (page 7, paragraph [0119]).

As noted in MPEP § 2131, it is well-founded that "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of*

*California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Further, "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The subject invention concerns the post-processing of a video signal having a plurality of views and associated disparity maps. As described in the specification on page 1, lines 7-22, a new view in the video signal may be reconstructed using pixels in the existing view and the associated disparity maps. However, when such a video signal and its associated disparity maps are transmitted, it is subjected to an encoding process having a compression algorithm, and a corresponding decoding process, during which the disparity maps may become impaired. During subsequent reconstruction of new views, points or areas could be translated to the wrong place (because of "wrong" disparity vectors), leading to texture discontinuities.

Applicants have found that when reconstructing a new view from another view and its impaired disparity map, the disparity map undergoes a transformation making it easier to detect problematic values than when using the original disparity map.

The Examiner has indicated that Xu et al. discloses "a method for post-processing a digital video signal (see [110], [112]), said digital video signal having a plurality of views with associated disparity maps (see figs. 7 and 8, [119] and [199])".

Applicants submit that the Examiner is mistaken. In particular, Xu et al. discloses processing a video signal having a plurality of views in order to generate disparity maps for each view. With reference to Fig. 7 therein, Xu et al. describes the invention on pages 6 and 7, paragraphs [0103]-[0119], in which the left and right view of a stereo video signal are process in order to output two complete stereo disparity maps.

The Examiner has further indicated that Xu et al. teaches "a first step of generating a projected disparity map from an original disparity map (see fig. 8, 20, [0198])".

Again, Applicants submit that the Examiner is mistaken. Figs. 8 and 20, as well as paragraph [0198] of Xu et al. clearly indicate that the stereo video signal is input and the stereo disparity maps are output therefrom. There is no disclosure or suggestion of generating a projected disparity map from an original disparity map.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that the subject invention, as claimed, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 1-12, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by Edward W. Goodman/  
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613

Attorney  
Tel.: 914-333-9611